

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 1, 3, and 7 have been amended. Claims 8-12 are newly presented. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Information Disclosure Statement

The information Disclosure Statement submitted on December 18, 2001 was objected to for not containing concise explanations of relevance or translations. Applicants submit herewith a new Information Disclosure Statement including English Language Abstracts of Korean Patents 99-19525, 00-644, and 00-6591 and an English Language translation of the Article written by You Sung Kang. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider these materials and initial and return form PTO-1449 as evidence of the Examiner's consideration of these materials.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action indicated that the term "terminal" lacked antecedent basis in the claims. Applicants have amended the claims to correct this minor error. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Fu et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0024066). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a method of setting a communication environment between a mobile terminal and a smart card using a layered architecture of a protocol stack, which includes sending an answer-to-reset signal from a smart card to a mobile terminal when the mobile terminal provides power to the smart card, determining whether or not the received answer-to-reset signal complies with an answer-to-reset signal pattern required by the mobile terminal, and analyzing the answer-to-reset signal transferred from the smart card to establish a communication environment suitable for an application to be used if the received answer-to-reset signal complies with an answer-to-reset signal pattern required by the mobile terminal. The Office Action alleges that AAPA discloses the above features. Applicants respectfully disagree.

AAPA merely discloses that after receiving an answer-to-reset signal, the mobile terminal 20 sends a request signal to the smart card, in step S103, and that the smart card, in step S104, sends a response signal to the mobile terminal. In AAPA, the smart card selects the relevant protocol and parameters. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the mobile terminal determines whether or not the received answer-to-reset signal complies with an answer-to-reset signal pattern required by the mobile terminal and, if it does, the mobile terminal analyzes the answer-to-reset signal transferred from the smart card to establish a communication environment suitable for an application to be used. No such analysis determination or analysis is performed by AAPA. In fact, by determining whether the received answer-to-reset signal complies with an answer-to-reset signal pattern required by the mobile terminal, the mobile terminal can avoid the requesting step S103 in AAPA. Furthermore, Fu does not remedy at least this deficiency of AAPA since F does not teach or suggest at least the above described feature of claim 1. Accordingly, no combination of AAPA and Fu teach or suggest, analyzing the answer-to-reset signal transferred from the smart card to establish a communication environment suitable for an application to be used if the received answer-to-reset signal complies with an answer-to-reset signal pattern required by the mobile terminal, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 7 is believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above since claim 7 also recites the feature of claim 1 discussed above.

Claims 2-6 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

New Claims

Claims 8-12 are newly presented, fully supported by the originally filed specification, and believed allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion


Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/029,288
Amendment dated May 12, 2005
Page 8

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: 
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: May 12, 2005